

Technical and Bibliographic Notes / Notes techniques et bibliographiques

The Institute has attempted to obtain the best original copy available for filming. Features of this copy which may be bibliographically unique, which may alter any of the images in the reproduction, or which may significantly change the usual method of filming, are checked below.

- Coloured covers/  
Couverture de couleur
- Covers damaged/  
Couverture endommagée
- Covers restored and/or laminated/  
Couverture restaurée et/ou pelliculée
- Cover title missing/  
Le titre de couverture manque
- Coloured maps/  
Cartes géographiques en couleur
- Coloured ink (i.e. other than blue or black)/  
Encre de couleur (i.e. autre que bleue ou noire)
- Coloured plates and/or illustrations/  
Planches et/ou illustrations en couleur
- Bound with other material/  
Relié avec d'autres documents
- Tight binding may cause shadows or distortion  
along interior margin/  
La reliure serrée peut causer de l'ombre ou de la  
distortion le long de la marge intérieure
- Blank leaves added during restoration may appear  
within the text. Whenever possible, these have  
been omitted from filming/  
Il se peut que certaines pages blanches ajoutées  
lors d'une restauration apparaissent dans le texte,  
mais, lorsque cela était possible, ces pages n'ont  
pas été filmées.
- Additional comments:/  
Commentaires supplémentaires:

This item is filmed at the reduction ratio checked below/  
Ce document est filmé au taux de réduction indiqué ci-dessous.

10X	14X	18X	22X	26X	30X
12X	16X	20X	J	24X	28X
32X					

L'Institut a microfilmé le meilleur exemplaire qu'il lui a été possible de se procurer. Les détails de cet exemplaire qui sont peut-être uniques du point de vue bibliographique, qui peuvent modifier une image reproduite, ou qui peuvent exiger une modification dans la méthode normale de filmage sont indiqués ci-dessous.

- Coloured pages/  
Pages de couleur
- Pages damaged/  
Pages endommagées
- Pages restored and/or laminated/  
Pages restaurées et/ou pelliculées
- Pages discoloured, stained or foxed/  
Pages décolorées, tachetées ou piquées
- Pages detached/  
Pages détachées
- Showthrough/  
Transparence
- Quality of print varies/  
Qualité inégale de l'impression
- Continuous pagination/  
Pagination continue
- Includes index(es)/  
Comprend un (des) index
- Title on header taken from:/  
Le titre de l'en-tête provient:**
  - Title page of issue/  
Page de titre de la livraison
  - Caption of issue/  
Titre de départ de la livraison
  - Masthead/  
Générique (périodiques) de la livraison

The Educational Policy  
of the  
Baptists of Ontario  
and Quebec



MCMASTER UNIVERSITY, TORONTO  
1920

The Educational Policy  
of the  
Baptists of Ontario  
and Quebec

BY

ABRAHAM LINCOLN MCCRIMMON, M.A., LL.D.  
CHANCELLOR OF McMaster UNIVERSITY

FOREWORD BY

D. E. THOMSON, K.C., LL.D.  
CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS  
OF McMaster UNIVERSITY

TORONTO  
1920

LC 562

M23

## FOREWORD

THE development of the educational work of the Baptists of Ontario and Quebec is the result of much sacrificial effort. Many choice lives have already been given to the enterprise. Other devoted servants of the Master are now carrying the burden under conditions far different, but scarcely less arduous than those which confronted their predecessors in earlier days.

The fascinating story is not without its elements of romance. Chancellor McCrimmon, in the pages which follow, makes no attempt to emphasize these elements. His masterly pen is employed rather in tracing the salient points of the history and in elucidating the denominational policy which has been evolved during the past 70 years.

His succinct and comprehensive review will surely be appreciated by all the friends of our educational institutions. It must also prove of very great value to the historian of the future.

D. E. THOMSON.

## CONTENTS

	Page
Its HISTORY . . . . .	5
The First Period, 1836-1854 . . . . .	5
The Second Period, 1855-1888 . . . . .	7
The Third Period, 1888-1920 . . . . .	11
THE CONSTITUTIONAL ASPECT OF OUR POLICY . . . . .	19
The Purpose in View . . . . .	19
The Material upon which we Work . . . . .	20
The Auspices under which we Work . . . . .	21
The Best Conditions for the Denomination to Accomplish its Task . . . . .	25
Misunderstandings of Our Policy . . . . .	30
THE LESSONS OF THE PAST FOR THE PRESENT . . . . .	32

## The Educational Policy of the Baptists of Ontario and Quebec

### I. Its History.

The history of the educational policy of the Baptists of the Convention of Ontario and Quebec divides itself into three periods: The first period, 1836-1854, was marked by attempts to furnish educational facilities, chiefly theological, to men for the ministry. The second period, 1855-1888, introduced a wider educational policy of extending educational privileges in Christian residential secondary schools to young men and women as well as providing more advanced training in Theology to prospective pastors. The third period, from 1888 to the present time, marks a further extension of education under Christian influence by affording a complete Arts course, thus filling the gap which had been hitherto left between secondary educational curricula and theological courses.

#### 1. The First Period, 1836-1854.

The principal achievement of the first period was the founding of the Canada Baptist College at Montreal. The Ottawa Association through Rev. John Gilmour interested English Baptists in the enterprise by means of the formation of the Canadian Baptist Missionary Society in London. The English Society, whose object was to do missionary work on the needy fields in Canada, agreed to support the new college. When the Baptist Convention of Upper Canada proposed to establish a college of their own and approached the English Baptists for support, they were advised to join their brethren in Montreal.

The Canada Baptist College tried to indoctrinate raw students from pioneer homes in the Oriental and Classical Literatures, Natural Philosophy, Theology, Philosophy and Ecclesiastical History. Two professors were engaged for this work. In the later forties attempts were made to widen the curricula. An advertisement in the Montreal *Register* states, "In compliance with numerous requests an Academic Department has been opened for the instruction of young gentlemen who are not of sufficient age to enter on the collegiate course, or whose parents wish them to be prepared for mercantile pursuits." The minimum age was placed at eight years. In addition to the two professors in Theology an English teacher and a French teacher were announced. With the close of the forties the college ceased operations

through non-support arising from "deep distrust and invincible indifference." The fine cut-stone building passed into the possession of the Roman Catholics.

The period to which the Canada Baptist College belonged was one of fierce antagonisms in the political, social and religious life of Canada. Dr. Cramp, one of the presidents of the College, was not only connected with *The Baptist Register*, but also with *The Pilot*, a Liberal paper. Denominational antipathy was prevalent. Episcopacy lifted a proud head. The Rector of Woodstock forbade Baptist conventicles. Bishop Strachan tried to make King's College, now the University of Toronto, an Episcopalian University. The Roman Catholics, the Presbyterians, the Wesleyan Methodists, as well as the Episcopilians were ready to accept a share of the school grant made to the whole people of Canada for general education. When Dr. Ryerson was attacked for using his Methodist connection to further his political interests, and his dismissal was demanded by some Baptists, the *Christian Guardian* thus retaliated: "that flagrant injustice can hardly be perpetrated against the Wesleyan Methodist Church with perfect impunity. . . . Who is proposed to take his place? . . . A Dr. Davies, who we believe is a Baptist Minister in Lower Canada. The very intimation of such a substitute is an insult."

Within the denomination itself dissension and antagonisms arose. One reads in the chronicles of the times how "groups discussed with virulence" the efficiency of learned *versus* unlearned ministers; opponents pointed out "the evil of the Baptist College and the central power of our present Missionary Society placed at an outside corner, and their agents endeavoring to enlist our support without giving us a voice in placing the one or choosing the other;" a further allusion was made to "an emissary from that hot-bed of dissension and disunion," a reference to the College manned by English open-communionists. The Editor of the *Register* foresaw the doom of the College: "The fury of some," he writes, "and the ingratitude and treachery of others will ultimately involve them in difficulties from which they will find it hard to extricate themselves."

The failure of the College may be attributed to many factors: its inconvenient location; the unsettled condition of the country's life; the fickle policy of the English Society; the jealousy over executive control in Montreal; the apathy towards Education on the part of Baptists; "The Baptists of Canada," wrote one critic, "were not in those days sufficiently enlightened to appreciate and sustain" such a College; some Baptists were opposed to any organized effort whether in missions or in education; others joined in the cry of "God-ordained

and not man-made ministers;" the College was not organized on sound pedagogical principles and did not reach the general home life of the Baptists; its conception of "missionary" and of the "ministry" was too narrow; its chief executive officer was not appointed or supported by Canadians; the College did not spring from, and was not supported by, the heart sweat of the people; it lacked the endowment necessary to carry it through periods of exceptional strain, and when the financial depression of the later forties hit the Baptist men of means in Montreal, who had staunchly supported it, its doors had to be closed.

After the closing of the Canada Baptist College there followed two abortive attempts to found a theological school, one in 1849, the other in 1853. The latter project was to culminate in "Maclay College" but never went beyond the paper stage, although some \$30,000 was promised towards its support. This unfulfilled scheme left much heart-burning. The policy for which it was to stand was education in theological subjects. Its promoters considered it "no part of their duties as Baptists to provide a school for classical or professional students."

This period is capable of teaching the Baptists much if they will give heed. The organized attempt and the missionary conception of education were valuable for all time. The object in view, to provide a native educated ministry, has proved a sound policy the world over. Though the Society which was responsible for the Principal of the College was English, its officers said "it was more important to educate young men in the field than to send out a considerable number of missionaries from England and Scotland." The eyes of Baptists were opened to the readiness of other religious denominations to take State appropriations for their distinctively denominational work. It was shown that a small denomination like the Baptist could not perpetuate a denominational enterprise of any size if they permitted theological strife, jealousy of control, suspicion of the character of teaching, anti-missionary and anti-educational elements, or virulent discussion of non-distinctive doctrines to destroy the possibility of unified, enthusiastic, whole-hearted endeavor. "Deep distrust and invincible indifference" will kill any enterprise.

#### *2. The Second Period, 1855-1888.*

The second period may be divided into two sub-periods: one when academic and theological training was given at Woodstock; the other, when academic training for young men and young women was given at Woodstock, and academic training for young women and theological training was given in Toronto.

This period manifests the influence of Robert Alexander Fyfe. In 1855 Dr. Fyfe proposed a literary institute to which Baptist parents could send their boys and girls, and at which our theological students could obtain ministerial training, both literary and theological. In those days the inefficiency of secondary schools and the fact that over one-half of the students had to go away from home to attend such schools were strong arguments in favour of the establishment of the Canadian Literary Institute. After twenty years of experience in the work and after secondary education had been greatly improved and brought nearly to the doors of the homes, Dr. Fyfe, reviewing the results of the Christian residential school and the very important incidental associations and religious atmosphere of this school, declared, "the necessity for a preparatory department seems more clear and imperative than ever." The proposal was to have the literary department co-educational. Dr. Fyfe explained the situation: "We could not raise money for two schools, one for gentlemen and one for ladies. So we put them together."

The object of the new policy was not merely to train men to be pastors but to bring together the young people of our denomination in the developmental process under positive religious conditions. Although the youth of other denominations were made welcome, one of the main benefits which it was hoped could be obtained was the greater unity of the denomination through the massing of the best young life under the same auspices and influences. The late Professor Trotter thus speaks of his days at Woodstock: "I found an institution that was so rich in everything that my life needed and that made such a ministration to me as to hundreds of others that I cannot think of it to-day without my heart growing very tender at the gracious recollection." From this testimony we see that noble personalities and spiritual atmosphere were doing their work. "The life and teaching were a perpetual challenge to the best that was in the students, and the fruitage of it all in idealism and attainment was incalculable. Every now and then the breath of God swept through the place, when scores of students were quickened to a new life in Christ, and others got their call to the ministry." One of the benefits of the new policy therefore was more recruits for the ministry.

This policy had been gradually forming itself in the mind of Dr. Fyfe while he was Acting-Principal at the College in Montreal for a year and while he was being educated and was working in the United States. In 1851 he wrote to a friend in Canada: "It must be self-evident to any clear-sighted man that nothing but a Canadian institution can supply Canada with a ministry. I have lived on both sides

of the line and am satisfied that the denominations in Canada lose much in every way by sending their sons to be educated in this country.

.... They lose in sympathy and in patriotic feeling when their tastes and habits of thought are formed here. I do not think that any well-wisher of Canada would like to see it a mere appendage, a kind of spiritual fief of the United States. And those who are educated here can scarcely help imbibing the notion or feeling that all countries under the sun are secondary to this." Thus another reason was deduced for the policy adopted.

From the necessities of its organisation and the material upon which it worked the College at Montreal could give only a veneering of theological instruction in the case of the majority of the students. The new policy would remedy this as far as it could give preparatory literary instruction.

Dr. Fyfe held very decided opinions as to the value of a thorough education under positive Christian influence for young men and women of all classes. It is this view of Christian Education which has led many of the men who have joined the staff of our colleges to leave even the pastorate that they might weave their Christian influence into the lives of developing young men and women destined to function in different callings of life. If this be not a missionary conception, then one will seek in vain for such a conception. When once a Christian man gets this missionary conception of Christian education he has the sufficient answer to the question why a man should support Christian schools in addition to State institutions.

The provision for literary education included the requirements for Junior Matriculation and for some additional work in Philosophy and Literature for ministerial students. Later, first year University work and, for a time, second year University work were added. The students were prepared for the examinations of the University of Toronto and the Institute was to that extent in affiliation with that University.

The question of location came up and was settled in favor of Woodstock; Brantford and Fonthill being the rival claimants. Three factors had the greatest weight: accessibility, local financial support, and a strong local church which might furnish members to the Executive Committee.

The building was begun in 1857 and opened in 1860. Then came the tug of financing. Already Archibald Burtch had mortgaged his house that the project might be consummated. It was proving a difficult problem; and almost despair was added to difficulty when the new building was burned to the ground within six months of its opening and there was left a legacy of debt of some \$6,000. Mr. McMaster and

the Woodstock citizens led the way in the attempts to "carry on." In addition to the voluntary gift of \$1,000 from the Woodstock citizens towards the rent of new quarters, the Town Council of Woodstock proposed to tax the people an additional \$600 for this purpose by making a grant of that amount. The Institute authorities refused to accept money raised by forced taxation from the citizens for a denominational project, much to the disgust of a Presbyterian magistrate who characterized their refusal as "foolish." One might with profit compare the municipal grants to Alma College and other denominational enterprises during the past few years. When some young man of this generation asks why McMaster does not go to the government for a grant, he should acquaint himself with the history of his denomination.

As in all educational work worthy of the name, succeeding years brought new demands and additional burdens of expenditure. Never was the way easy or the burden light. Professor Wells likens Dr. Fyfe's experience to the labour of Sisyphus with his perpetually rolling stone. The Professor exclaims: "Had he lived to see the McMaster Hall of to-day, projected and established, his heart would have indeed been glad." Had the Professor lived long enough he would have seen that Dr. Fyfe's successors were not relieved from the Sisyphean task.

During this period the student who wished an Arts course, obtained his collegiate training at Woodstock, then went to Toronto University for his Arts, and afterwards took his theological work. The professors complained of the leakage and of the waste even for those who returned. Some were content then, as even now, to finish their course without theological training. To such Dr. Fyfe had something to say: "If any one mistakes a B.A. for an adequate preparation for the ministry he will make a woful blunder. And if he go to another country to study, there are fifty chances to one that he will do his life-work there."

Respecting leakage and other unsatisfactory features, Professor Wells expresses his "unshaken conviction that the Baptists of Ontario will never be in a position to accomplish fully their high mission and to place themselves abreast of the foremost religious bodies of the country in Christian influence and power for good until they shall have in Woodstock or elsewhere a well-endowed college thoroughly equipped for full University work."

Dr. Fyfe died in 1878. In 1881 the theological work was transferred to Toronto. In 1888 co-education was discontinued at Woodstock and Moulton College was opened to women students. Thus while the general policy was preserved the student-body was divided into three new student-bodies. Young men obtained their academic training at Woodstock College; young women registered at Moulton College in

Toronto; men in Theology were enrolled in Toronto Baptist College at McMaster Hall, the gift of Senator McMaster, who also endowed the College. There was still one link lacking in Professor Wells' desideratum,—an Arts department.

When one's mind runs over this period he wonders how far the Baptists of to-day measure up in sacrifice and support to the Baptists of yesterday. There were to be found then, as possibly now, Baptists who despised education because they had no personal experience of it; there were those who questioned the theological teaching at Woodstock and at Toronto Baptist College; there were those who would rather spend their energies in un-denominational or inter-denominational work while the work for which the Convention to which they belonged was responsible, was neglected; there were those who would not support the College because they disagreed with some part of its policy; there were those who when difficulties appeared on the horizon found their own personal affairs required their whole attention. I suppose we shall always find such wayward sons who fail to see things whole and forsake a great cause because defective in their judgment at some one point. A very important question, however, presents itself: Have we still our Fyfes, our McMasters, our Archibald Burtches?

It is significant that the leaders in education in both of the periods we have examined were deeply interested in the political and social life of Canada,—Dr. Davies and Dr. Cramp of the first period, and Dr. Fyfe and Senator McMaster of the second period.

### *3. The Third Period, 1888 to the Present.*

The third period of the history of our educational policy is marked by the addition of an Arts Department, and the obtaining of a University Charter which granted degree-conferring power in Arts and Theology.

The Honourable William McMaster bequeathed \$900,000 to found McMaster University. A special convention was held in Guelph in 1888 to decide the character of the institution and its location. The decision of the Convention was to organize and develop the institution as a permanently independent Christian school of learning and to establish it in Toronto. Thus the realisation of the ideals of the second period was carried one step further. The decision also agreed with the previously avowed intention of developing the educational work to university status as promised to Dr. Rand when in 1886 he accepted the principalship of Woodstock College. The only thing which had prevented such development was the financial disability. There were some however who favored federation with the University of Toronto.

There were some also who argued that Woodstock had a prior claim to the University. As the Woodstock location issue no longer receives attention, we need not review the arguments pro and contra. Federation, however, since McMaster is so conveniently located in the vicinity of the University of Toronto and since such a policy seems to some to be able to give financial relief when financial difficulties appear, has received attention from time to time.

As early as 1884 Dr. Castle and Dr. MacVicar investigated the federation scheme and the Baptist Union meeting in Brantford made a conditional declaration in favor of it, "provided such federation can be secured on such terms as shall adequately recognize the paramount importance of the Christian element in education and satisfactorily secure to us the control thereof as far as our own denomination is concerned." As the matter was further investigated the Baptist representatives became distrustful of the scheme and Dr. Castle reported in 1886 at the Paris Convention that "the federation possible was far from the Brantford resolution as a number of subjects would be taken from us which we ought to have and leave only a language school."

It seems, according to the editorials of the *Canadian Baptist* of 1886, that the original scheme of federation which Dr. Castle and others were ready to consider was "a congeries of colleges co-ordinate with University College, each doing the entire work of the full course and standing in the same relation to the examining and degree-conferring University. . . . But when this scheme was diluted into a proposal to divide Arts courses between the Colleges and a University professoriate giving to the latter some of the subjects most important in an educational point of view, and when to this was added a series of easy substitutes . . . it may have seemed to some that the really valuable features of the original scheme had been obliterated. . . . Others may have gone even farther and begun to query whether the scheme as last shaped did not have too much the appearance of reintroducing, by a side-wind, the principle of State aid to denominational colleges which was formally abolished some years ago by the people's representatives."

These editorials agree with Dr. Castle's statement to the Paris Convention and with Dr. Holman's at the final meeting of the subscribers of Woodstock College at which the acceptance of the trust from Mr. McMaster was discussed. Dr. Holman, after expressing his firm belief in denominational education, said, "Federation which was at first proposed was of such a character as might be accepted by all, but the emasculated scheme now before us ought not to receive our confidence."

The Paris Convention commissioned the Board to seek a charter from the Government. The representatives of the Baptists who approached the Government for the Charter were wise enough not to attack at that time the policy of the Government which was sponsor for the federation plan although they found that one of the strongest objections taken to granting a charter was that such legislation would prevent the full working of the federation plan. The spokesmen of the Baptist delegation which waited on the Premier were Dr. Castle, Dr. Rand, Mr. John M. Grant, a citizen of Woodstock, and Dr. Thomson.

Dr. Castle, in addressing the Premier, said: "I am enabled to say that the genius and spirit and proclivity of our body from the beginning has been in the direction of organizing and maintaining,—and organizing and maintaining efficiently—Christian schools for higher learning under religious control. . . . Perhaps in us deeper than in most Christian bodies, the thought of separation between Church and State has taken a deeper hold . . . while bearing all the other taxes which come through the State for education without a word of complaint or murmur . . . yet taxing ourselves to this extent for the maintenance of such institutions. . . . But I may remind you, Sir, that by our principles we are prohibited from asking assistance of the Government. We come asking not one foot of land; we come asking not one dollar out of the Provincial treasury; we come asking only for that protection . . ."

Dr. Rand emphasized the fact that they were not asking for money for the promotion of their educational work. He said they did not come to attack the federation policy of the Government though "possibly upon the last analysis, if they were to examine the matter very clearly, some of us might feel that the principles which have led us to refuse public aid for a denominational purpose when directly given ought to make us slow to receive it when indirectly given. . . . Christian principles, Christian instruction, the illumination of Christian thinking and doing ought to be central and controlling in this matter. You know, Sir, that we are too logical on this question to suppose that the State can properly do such work." Dr. Rand referred to his own connection with State education in the Maritime Provinces and in answer to an anticipated objection by the Premier as to why the Baptists did not federate with Toronto University said, "Well, Sir, an institution is not conditioned to discharge in any high and adequate degree its functions as an educational body unless it is self-competent—an organism having an independent life. Suppose the course of instruction is prescribed by an outside authority. . . . Such extraneous prescription, of necessity, lodges the leverage of the college outside of itself,

and so emasculates it of controlling form and energy in the real work of education."

Mr. D. H. Thomson closed the appeal with an address dealing with the rights of the petitioners and the safeguards they could give,—an address which the opponents of the Charter Bill afterwards declared had the most decisive influence with the Government.

At the Jarvis Street Convention and at the meetings of the subscribers of Woodstock College and of other official bodies when the acceptance of the trust was under consideration, both the question of independency and of the location of the Arts department were discussed. It was finally decided to call a special Convention at Guelph to consider these questions. In the meantime the *Canadian Baptist* invited a free discussion of the whole matter. In fact, from 1884 to 1888 there was the most lively presentation of arguments and counter-arguments.

The Editor of the *Baptist* in 1886 pointed out that the two main lines of argument of the advocates of federation were these: first, the financial one, Mr. Cameron pointing out that to attempt to run a University on the endowment assured was similar to the attempt "to run a wholesale establishment with the capital requisite for a pea-nut stand;" the second, that it is the admitted province of the Government to run such an institution. The Editor in reply said that it was not proposed to duplicate the technical and expensive specialist work of a State institution and that it was a question for the people to decide how far there should be general taxation for the small percentage of men who entered the professions.

The federationists used such arguments as the following: the degrees would be more valuable; the expense would be less, leaving more for other denominational objects; there was no reason for supporting another Arts course when we were already supporting one at Toronto; by federation McMaster would not be a rival of but a helper to the Provincial University; that federation was in harmony with the Charter, with the will of Senator McMaster, with our denominational principles and with those of Christian education. Comparisons were made between the clear daylight of State institutions and the cloistered mists of denominational colleges. Sir John Boyd and other advocates of federation advanced these arguments and others which will be repeated later, with the ability and power which belong to the trained mind.

Such educationists as Castle, Rand, MacVicar, Wolverton, Wells, Farmer, and such lawyers as Thomson and Holman were all in favor of independence. They advanced arguments to meet those mentioned above by referring to the value of the degrees of other denom-

inational Universities and to the charter provision of a standard equal to that of the University of Toronto; to the indissoluble connection of other denominational enterprises with this one of leadership; to the fact that it was not a condition of rivalry but one of supplement and control for our religious purpose; to doubts about being able to carry out the spirit of the will of Mr. McMaster, or of the Charter, or about being true to our principles under federation. Dr. Holman thought independence would probably result in turning Arts students to Theology. Professor Wells proposed a dilemma on the receiving of State aid through federation: Either we would receive such aid or we would not. If we did not, then there was no advantage financially; if we did, then we violated our principles. The records of denominational institutions were cited to show that not all clear daylight nor all achievement were confined to State institutions, in which sometimes there was circumference without a centre.

The Guelph Convention was one of the largest ever held by the Baptists of these provinces. Its president was Dr. D. E. Thomson, whose praises as presiding officer were on the lips of all the delegates. At the opening of the Convention the President referred to the important matters at issue and to the confidence in the Baptist constituency which Senator McMaster had displayed. "We shall search in vain," he said, "the annals of the past for any former case in which the control of an institution of learning has been so unreservedly confided to popular power." Mr. McMaster evidently expected no outside authority or no clique within the denomination to shape the policy of our educational institutions. As to the relation of the trust to our principles Dr. Thomson said, "By accepting the trust we have made it part of our mission as a people. So if our distinctive views are not to shape its destiny it must be because these views are all wrong, or because we, by the universal acceptance of them, have, as the French say, exhausted our mandate. In either case we advertise to the world that we have no longer warrant for our separate existence." And that statement holds as true to-day as it did in 1888.

Dr. Trotter moved the substantive motion, "That this Convention affirms its judgment that McMaster University should be organized and developed as a permanently independent school of learning with the Lordship of Christ as the controlling principle." Two amendments were proposed: one, to postpone the discussion of federation; the other, to eliminate the word "permanently." Both amendments were lost and the motion carried by a large majority. The location was settled in favor of Toronto. The address of Dr. Trotter on the Lordship of Christ was considered one of the decisive addresses.

Thus the Arts department was added and the organization of that work was commenced. It is seen now that on the financial side one mistake was made. The educational authorities relieved the churches of annual contributions since the immediate demands were being met from the McMaster bequest. When the contributions of the churches are not being invested in an enterprise, to a certain extent the nerve of interest is cut and the people are not being educated to the fact that the development of young life calls for ever-increasing investments. The members of the denomination came to think that McMaster was well provided for no matter how the nation or the denomination developed and that the professors were placed in remunerative positions. The truth is that only a few years elapsed until new buildings were needed and with the advance of salaries in other institutions the professors were placed in no enviable position.

Whenever the necessities of expansion demand greater expenditures and consequently larger contributions, some one harks back to some alternative scheme, either federation, or training in theology only, or the elimination of some other parts of our work. In 1905, when the denomination was called upon to raise \$75,000 for new buildings, numerous articles appeared in the *Canadian Baptist* respecting educational policy, but the denomination as a whole did not seem to be deeply interested in any change of policy. An editorial appeared in the *Globe* stating that McMaster stands high for the robust culture of its graduates whenever these come into comparison or competition with the graduates of other universities on this continent, but suggesting federation since Baptists would thus be relieved of furnishing expensive Science equipment and would be free to devote their funds to the limited Arts course of the colleges and the development of the theological faculty.

Federationists expressed doubt about being able to raise \$75,000 for education and at the same time meet the claims of home and foreign missions; they also doubted our ability to carry on work which the Provincial University does with the Provincial treasury at its back; they employed the old arguments respecting efficiency, value of degrees, scholarship and fellowship privileges; the Provincial University belonged to us as well as to the rest of the citizens of Ontario; the lofty ideals of Toronto University respecting the truth were referred to; the examples of godly men believing in federation; the benefits of the small college would not be lost in federation; the social culture of the student would be more extensive; Victoria College was a practical example of the success of federation; to be consistent, anti-federationists should take over primary education also as do the Roman Catholics; federation

would give Baptists and their professors a real voice in the educational affairs of the Province; would bring more students to McMaster; the courses at McMaster were already to a great extent controlled by the Education Department and by the standard of Toronto University; Baptists ought to join with others in leavening the life of the Provincial University; that no university could be great that made scholarship second to any consideration whatever when making appointments to the staff.

Those in favor of independence replied that it was a fallacy to think that the amount of money in a given denomination in a given time is a somewhat definite quantity and that the more you put into one denominational project, the less there is for another; that it is not proposed to compete with Toronto University in applied and technical science, but the emphasis is placed upon making the man, not the specialist; that McMaster has proved itself efficient as the editorial in the *Globe* stated; that her degrees were respected wherever her graduates went; that she had scholarship privileges of her own; that they believed in the State University but also believed that McMaster could do a work from the denominational and missionary viewpoint which was of great importance to the nation; that her greatest contribution could be made by preserving her independence and sending her graduates into the life of the world; that the example of Methodists and Anglicans was not a safe precedent for Baptists to follow, as the preceding periods of educational history show; that the benefits of the small college would be jeopardized by federation; that the small independent Christian college from its organization gave extensive as well as intensive culture; that the small representation McMaster would have in federation Councils would be ineffective; that McMaster would lose control of her courses, of a number of the professors who would teach her students and to a great extent of her students themselves; that even under federation she would register only students attending in Arts and not in the other departments of Toronto University; that McMaster would lose her degree conferring power both in course and *honoris causa*; that as a Baptist denomination we would impair our usefulness as a distinctive exponent of what we consider to be the right relation between Church and State because we would have clouded our relationship to the State; that the increased number of Baptists taking Arts courses and the success of McMaster justify independence; that independence has been the only accepted policy of our Baptist brethren in the United States where Baptists support 250 universities, colleges and academies, and where the increase of Baptists has been unsurpassed; that scholarship and Christian edu-

tional evangelism can be found together, but if this were not the case, then . . . "ordship of Christ should not suffer; that in the matter of expense also it is not clear that much would be saved if we keep in mind that our emphasis is upon making the man, the woman, who to-day must face post-graduate work in any case if first-class specialization is to be obtained; that the courses at Toronto University are prematurely overspecialized, which accounts for the statement of the Victoria professor quoted by federationists, "we spend quite as much money as before, and probably more. . . . We have two or three men (professors or instructors) in one department where there was only one before."

The federation movement has never been favored by the great majority of Baptists, probably for the reason Dr. Newman gave for the Guelph finding, "The prevailing feeling . . . that it would be unwise to entangle ourselves with a State institution over which we could expect to have only a very limited control."

The growth of McMaster led the Senate and Board of Governors to recommend to the Convention that since the present site of McMaster was so limited, a new site should be procured and new buildings erected. The Convention approved of our policy. The field which had been used as a campus by McMaster and which was situate some distance from the Hall, was sold and the Board proceeded to buy a new site. Then came a change in the chancellorship and the new Chancellor at the Montreal Convention in 1911 asked the Convention respecting its policy in the following words: "At the last Convention you debated the report of the Senate and Board which announced the policy of selling the present buildings and site, and of purchasing a new site. Owing to the pressure of other matters, this policy did not receive due consideration. Now I want you to think carefully of this removal problem, and what it involves on your part. We want no uncertain key-note for the future. We wish to know what we can depend upon. We wish to know how far you are willing to get behind this project which calls for generous support. We want it understood that as soon as the calls are met which are now upon you for some of the other great movements, we are to have right of way. We have got to the point where unless we go forward, we will go backward. Our men and women of wealth should recognize that our educational expansion movement is the next project which demands support. With this applause of yours for our great mission, for the necessity of leadership, for the recognition of our historic position, will you reaffirm that position, and pledge your hearty support to our policy of expansion?" In the report of the speech the Editor of the *Baptist* adds a footnote: "There was no uncertain response

to the closing appeal of Chancellor McCrimmon. It was resolved unanimously to reaffirm the position taken at the Guelph Educational Convention to establish and maintain an independent University having Christian ideals. This means the acceptance of large responsibilities, concerning which we shall have more to say in the near future."

So the Board purchased a new site, following out the instructions of the Convention. Had they known that the Kaiser would set the world on fire, they would have waited until after the war. It has taken some \$9,000 a year to carry that site. When the war closed the Mission Boards found themselves in dire straits and the McMaster Board held in abeyance their right of way granted at the Montreal Convention until relief came to the Mission Boards.

Out of the Forward Movement Fund, however, McMaster is to get, after the expenses of the movement are deducted, one-fifth of the first \$300,000 and one-fifth of any surplus after the next \$90,000 has been assigned to the Superannuation Fund. This appropriation to McMaster is for maintenance until the larger drive for our education institutions is launched according to the right of way guaranteed to us at Montreal.

## II. THE CONSTITUTIONAL ASPECTS OF OUR POLICY.

From the historical review many points relating to the fundamental principle of our educational policy have become apparent. It remains for us to set them forth in a more systematized form and to relate them to the religious genius of our denomination.

### *1. The Purpose in View.*

The object we have set before us is a missionary one.

(a) In the first place, to produce educated men and women for Christ; to give under Christian influence development to young men and young women, in their earlier adolescence at our academic institutions, in their later adolescence at McMaster; to develop men and women so that their theoretical and practical life is organically related to the creative personality of the Saviour of the world.

(b) In the second place, to produce a well-equipped, well-developed, consecrated, native ministry who shall become leaders in our denominational life and the life of the nation.

(c) In the third place, by our system of schools for adolescents to give opportunities to our people to think together, to work together, to cherish common ideals and to become identified with common purposes; thus to unify our denomination whose members are so apt to be held apart by our principles of independence and local autonomy,

and to help it to bring the full force of its spiritual life to bear upon the fulfilment of our mission.

(d) In the fourth place, to supplement the efforts of other schools and colleges in the development of the adolescent life of the nation, and by sending out men and women from the Christian atmosphere of our schools into teaching and other vocations, to add to the Christian factors in the nation's life and so to stabilize that life and to bring the Kingdom of God to bear upon national and international affairs.

The question of leadership is the largest question which any denomination of Christians or community of men can consider. The success of every denominational enterprise, of every national undertaking, of every movement for the uplift of mankind depends upon leadership. If the Baptist denomination fails to provide leadership, lay and clerical, of the right type, it will fail in the complete fulfilment of its mission. If ever this world is to be conquered for Christ the leadership employed will not be a leadership founded merely on naturalistic education and technically scientific development on the one hand, nor on narrow fanatical spiritualism on the other. The leadership which will win the day will be broad-based, intelligent, adequately-equipped, harmoniously developed leadership shot through and through with the vitalizing spirit of the great God.

## *2. The Material upon which we Work.*

The importance of such a system of schools in addition to the State system is emphasized by the character of the material upon which we work,- the life of youth from thirteen to twenty-five years of age. This period of adolescence is now recognized as a most critical one in the organization of the factors of individual life, in the unifying of the outlook upon life, in the choice of a life-work, in the adoption of life's ideals.

The great divisional experience of puberty has ushered the embryonic leader into adolescence. Now come epoch-marking physical changes. Sex modifications of far-reaching importance, mental correlatives of revolutionary character, the storm and stress of new emotions, the conflict of intellectual standards, the varying emphases of resolutions, the criticism of earlier religious experiences, the age when by far the greater number of conversions take place. Stanley Hall says, "The young pubescent achieving his growth in the realm of fundamental qualities, dimly, functions, comes up to adult size at 18 relatively limp and inept, like an insect which has accomplished its last moult, and therefore far more in need of protection, physical care, moral and intellectual guidance." Now heredity is tested; now the architecture of

the soul is tried. Order must be brought out of chaos, purpose out of indecision, and the stretches of the soul towards the infinite should be directed to God. Never was there such an opportunity for missionary endeavor. Never again will the life be so susceptible to Christ's influence.

Amid all this adolescent vacillation and uncertainty, these varying emphases, this struggle after foundations and ideals, what are some of the factors which appear at once capable of steadyng this adolescent life and guiding it towards Christian leadership? It is not so much the mingling with other adolescents who, in the words of Stanley Hall, have just accomplished their last moult, helpful as that may be, but contact with strong consecrated experienced personalities, with an atmosphere and conditions which nurture aright, and with a continuity in the influence of such personalities and conditions. Just as the personality of father and of mother in the home, just as the atmosphere of the home, just as the day by day continuity of influence of the home, surely leave their impress on the growing son or daughter, so do such factors function in the schools for adolescents. Can we do anything to guarantee the Christian character of the teacher, the religious atmosphere of the school, the conditions of the daily and hourly round of consecutive duties? It is only the Christian college that is free to do this, the college that is avowedly Christian, that insists upon evangelical church membership for its teachers, that considers its work a mission for Christ. Notwithstanding all that Christian teachers may do wherever they may be working, no State system can constitutionally provide such conditions. The home, the Sunday school, the church organisations alone can constitutionally provide such factors. The Christian college is the natural and inevitable complement to the Christian home, the church and the Sunday school. The State schools are worthy of all praise as they direct students to the truth, but after all any truth is unrelated truth, is truth without its meaning for life, until it is centred in Christ, the Son of God, the God of truth. Each one of the factors, personality, atmosphere, continuity of influence, is of vital importance. To furnish such factors is a most difficult task and demands the fullest control possible.

### *3. The Auspices under which we Work.*

(1) The auspices under which our schools function are those of a Christian denomination. The work which a Christian denomination undertakes must be characterized primarily by the purpose of Christ; to preach and to teach, to save and to develop in the Kingdom of God. Just as the Sunday School and the Missionary Society come within this

purpose, so, as we have seen, does the Christian college. The future of the Christian Church depends largely upon the character of its leadership. The obligation to do evangelistic and developmental Christian work is limited only by the ability of a denomination so to act.

(2) The Christian denomination under whose auspices our schools are conducted is the Baptist denomination. When it comes therefore to a consideration of working with other denominations or with the State, the principles which make the Baptists a distinct denomination must be considered. If you destroy the principles and institutions of a people, you also destroy the matrix from which their development and efficiency spring. It is quite conceivable that Baptists can consistently work with other evangelical bodies of Christians as a co-operating denomination but not in an organic union. It is also conceivable that Baptists could be responsible for independent Christian schools as supplementary to the institutions of the State but could not federate with State Universities without violating their principles or cutting the nerve of their efficiency by compromising their policy through the dubiety of their relationship.

The fundamental principles of Baptists are well known to us and include salvation through personal faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, regenerate Church membership, baptism by immersion, the Lordship of Christ, the supremacy and authority of the Scriptures in matters of faith and practice, liberty of conscience, congregationalism and independency, the separation of Church and State.

It is the separation of Church and State which is the principle involved in a discussion of federation with the Provincial University. It must be remembered at the outset that although one may believe that we could hold our fundamental principles inviolate and federate, yet such action might not be the best for us to take. It may be premised that it is no valid argument to say that as we act contrary to our principles in accepting freedom from taxation for churches and schools, therefore we might as well extend our inconsistency in the matter of federation. It may be said in passing that Jarvis Street Church paid taxes voluntarily contributed for years as an object lesson to the Government without avail and came to the conclusion that until there was a more general movement on the part of the Government their position was an inequitable one.

What would federation mean as far as the inter-relation of Church and State is concerned? Only experience by Baptists in such a federation would make us sure of all it would mean to us from the principal standpoint. We do not believe in a State Church, or that every citizen comes within the jurisdiction of the Church by right of citizenship, or

that children are born into the Kingdom and all we have to do is to keep them there. Under some church systems devotees could mix up Church and State functions in almost every conceivable manner but Baptists could not do so. Because our Anglican or Presbyterian or Methodist friends find that there is no violation of conscience for them in federation, is no valid argument that Baptists would find no such violation. The history of the past and the record of the present prove this. We are not trying to stigmatize these denominations. We are pointing out that their genius and history are different. Dr. Strachan had no compunctions about ecclesiasticizing a provincial university. The Kirk of Scotland, the Roman Catholics and the Wesleyan Methodists were quite willing to accept their share of the spoils when the Church of England was forced to admit other competitors to the public subsidy. Alm. College has no misgivings about accepting municipal grants as the Baptists had when they refused the Woodstock Council's appropriations. Public grants for denominational missions and schools are readily received by some denominations. It is therefore quite possible that other denominations might rest easy under federation while Baptists would feel the relationship intolerable.

Our history shows that the relation of religious denominations to national education cannot be handled in any cavalier manner. Our fathers contended might and main against both voluntarists and non-voluntarists who would forcibly exploit the national treasury in the interests of enterprises which they wish to carry on under denominational control, whether the people in general approved of it or not. Dr. Fyfe said to one of these denominations who could not withstand the opportunity of State assistance, "Episcopalians never pretended to be voluntarists; you always have. . . . If it was wrong for the High Church party to seize upon that property then it was wrong for you to be a partaker in the public robbery."

It is significant that when Dr. Castle found out what federation really meant, he told the Paris Convention that it would not meet the wishes of Baptists and that the other strong educationists of the time favored independence. In fact Dr. Castle declared that, "the feeling had been growing on him that without such an (independent) university, the Senator's will could not be honestly carried out."

It is difficult, as we said above, to understand the full bearing of federation on our fundamental principles. A few points however are fairly clear. Federation is not simply a matter of affiliation. A federating university divides the work of the curricula with the University of Toronto. It becomes a school of languages only with the exception of Ethics and Ancient History. Toronto University gives the instruction

in Mathematics, Science, Philosophy, Political and Social Science including History, as well as in Italian and Spanish. The federating university has virtually nothing to say respecting the appointment of the Board of Governors which consists of the Chancellor, the President, and twenty-two members appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council. That is, the Board of Governors is politically appointed. The federating university has nothing to say respecting the appointment of professors in the department in which instruction is given in Toronto University. Such appointments rest with the Board of Governors. These professors in Science and Philosophy may be Christian or not, since the Charter of the Provincial University definitely states that no religious test shall be demanded of them. No wonder the late Chancellor Burwash of Victoria said that he could conceive of a state of affairs in Philosophy where a change might be desirable. He might have included the other subjects as well.

Federation means this sort of collaboration of Church authorities with certain appointments under their control, and of the State authorities with appointments beyond the control of the Church authorities; and at the same time it means that all tuition fees go to the Church authorities and the State authorities furnish their courses free to the Church authorities. A student who enrolls at the State college, University College, pays all his fees to State authorities and gets his courses from State professors. A student who registers at a federating college gets part of his instruction from State professors but pays all his tuition fees to the Church authorities. Thus it would seem to some that to the extent of the courses given by the State authorities is the Church enterprise subsidized by the State. Others will say that this is no transgression of our principles. I rather think most men after reviewing the whole matter will declare that they are not so sure about that, for it is just in the matter of subsidisation, appointment and control that we have taken our stand respecting the inter-relation of Church and State. The Baptist denomination would probably demand a clarifying of the relationship before they committed themselves.

The political control of Universities is of comparatively recent date among us. It has been fraught with serious menaces of wire-pulling and chicanery in some of the American States. Fortunately our Provincial University has not felt the menace seriously although there are some rumblings of discontent. There has been more dissatisfaction about appointments, but even here, Toronto has been more fortunate than some State institutions. What the future may have in store in the way of political interference, or of the character of appointments, one cannot be sure. Probably if financial stringency ever demands a modi-

fication of our educational institutions, it is this relation of Church to State which will be one of the deciding factors.

The situation under federation would be, that a denominationally appointed Board would work with a politically appointed Board in providing our students with professors, some of whom might be atheists or agnostics (and those who know State Universities on the continent well know that this is no stretch of the imagination) in the work of developing our youth; and at the same time they would be consenting to a pact whereby degree-conferring power would be vested in the State University and all the tuition fees would go to the denominational institution.

This, no doubt, was the reason why Baptists at Guelph felt "that it would be unwise to entangle ourselves with a State institution over which we could expect to have only a limited control." Even if we believed that no fundamental principle of ours would be violated in federation, it might not be wise for us to run the risk of the development of politics, or of putting ourselves in an equivocal position which would be resented by many Baptists and which might impair the success of our denominational mission. It is presumed that the wise thing for an individual is not to act when his conscience is not sure whether such action is right or conducive to the best results; the same presumption will apply to a Christian denomination. Probably here is where attempts at federation will find the Baptists of our Convention refusing to take the risk. In the final analysis it becomes a question not of financial outlay but of principle.

#### *4. The Best Conditions for the Denomination to Accomplish its Task.*

Let us recall that our mission in education is with the adolescent in the uncertain years of his youth when he is trying out his tentatives, striving in this direction and that, criticizing his social and religious relations, seeking his ideals, discovering his life-work; that our purpose is to place Christ at the centre of this life as it comes in contact with the great disciplines of civilization, so that His creative personality may organize and direct the developing powers; that to accomplish this purpose there are required Christian teachers, Christian conditions, continuous action of these personalities and conditions, and freedom to exercise such influences; that to furnish this continuous exercise of Christian influence, there must be adequate control so that there may be as great a guarantee as possible respecting the character of the teachers and the conditions; that as a Baptist denomination we must act consistently with our principles, or not act at all.

(1) Of the alternative policies discussed, which is the best for us to accomplish our purpose of developing adolescents into leaders for Christ? Our present system wrought out through years of sacrifice rendered more severe through adherence to principle, gives us charge of the youth throughout his adolescence. It speaks to him every year; it influences him every day; it furnishes him with Christian teachers chosen because they are members of evangelical churches; it indoctrinates him with the principles of scholarship and civilization efficiently; it furnishes him with an atmosphere in which it is the natural and customary procedure to attend Chapel service; it gives the student a broad course of liberal culture in which to find himself and his sphere of work and at the same time gives an introduction to specialization; it has proved itself effective in preparing students for entrance upon post-graduate work and professional study; there is no thought too strenuous for its activity, no freedom too great for its chastened democracy; it is conducive to the cohesiveness and solidarity of our denomination and renders it a more effective fighting unit in the church militant; it furnishes one of our greatest missionary fields in the growing leadership of its student bodies; it helps to provide that ninety per cent. of Christian leaders for the denominations which come from the denominational colleges on this continent; it safeguards its faculty because the denomination is sensitive to these appointments; it turns the thoughts of its Arts students to the ministry to keep them within calling distance; it functions without creating any misgivings as to whether the denomination is conscientiously fulfilling its sacred trust; it appeals to the homes of our people in which there are children from twelve to twenty-five years of age; it is a perpetual challenge to the hearts of our members to consecrate their children to the Lord's work; it complements from a religious standpoint and under religious influences, the home, the church and the Sunday school, and at the same time complements from the educational standpoint the other universities of Canada.

And it does all this consistently with our principles; its spirit is distinctly missionary as all denominational activities should be; it accords with the genius of our denomination in its emphasis upon freedom and independence and co-operation of autonomous units; it weaves without break the web of our history so that the principles of the past concreted in the sacrifices of Fyfe and McMaster and Burtch stand forth in the expression of to-day's life. There is no whisper of violation of principles to disturb the conscience; there are no gaps in the system through which the material is drained off; it only remains to make it more efficient and more consecrated to the work of the Kingdom.

(2) Should lack of support render it necessary to cut off the Arts work or reduce McMaster to a Junior College, or shut up our academic departments, we would not only be turning back the wheels of progress which were set in motion by the sacrifices of our fathers, not only show that this generation has not the same high estimate of Christian education entertained by our ancestors, but would also break the continuity of our Christian influence on adolescent life, circumscribe the sphere of our religious endeavor, lose to us many a leader for our work and impair the cohesive power which a Christian university gives to the denomination under whose auspices it operates.

We could get rid of our obligations this way without the least appearance of transgressing our principle respecting Church and State but we would relieve ourselves only by evading obligation which we ought to honour, if we are able to do so. There is no investment which pays as large dividends as investments in Christian leadership.

(3) How would federation affect the carrying out of our educational purpose as a Baptist Christian denomination? How would it affect the control of educational facilities? What comparative guarantees could it give regarding the Christian character of teachers, the Christian conditions of academic life and the continuity of such influences? What relief would it bring financially to us? How would it appeal to the heart of our denomination?

As to control, we would surrender our power of conferring degrees in Arts. Our denomination would have no control of the Board of Governors of the University, nor of their appointments of President and university professors and lecturers. Instead of having full control of our courses the only influence we would have would be that of our representatives on the Senate, who would form but a small part of that body. For example, instead of our Alumni having ten representatives as they now have on the McMaster Senate they would have five on a Senate two or three times as large. We would be committed to the highly specialized courses of Toronto University which, after the first year or two, prevent students from getting a liberal education, and are of such a character that educationists like Stanley Hall have advocated the starting of a movement to de-universitize college courses. We would have no control over professors teaching Science, Philosophy, Political Science, History or Mathematics. We would have no continuous control over our students, who would spend a large portion of their time elsewhere and live in a condition of divided interest.

As to guarantees respecting teaching and conditions we could furnish our constituency no guarantee where we had no control. From any constitutional standpoint we could not guarantee the character of

the Board or of the President or of the Professors who were appointed by the Board. No religious tests could be applied. Should everything be above reproach at any one time in these regards that could give no assurance respecting the next appointments. We would not control and therefore we could not guarantee. And the necessity for such guarantees in Arts work relates itself to the very subjects about which a religious denomination becomes nervous: the relation of Science to religion, of Philosophy to religion, of Social Science and the Philosophy of History to the foundations of Christianity. All you would have left to McMaster would virtually be a school of languages. Any one who has passed through the critical stages of scientific theory with its tendency to put all the realms of experience under its categories, or through the sphere of philosophic thought in which the gaunt forms of pantheism and deism and countless other "isms" rear themselves, knows how much depends upon a student's appraisal of the professor and the answer to the question, "Does he still hold to the evangelical truths of Christianity?" And we would have no guarantee as to how that question could be answered. It is no answer to such an objection to say, "Never mind, toss them in; if they are strong enough they will come out, if they are not, let them go down." Such an answer misses the mark of the value of experience and the directional element in education. The experiences of Romanes, of Sir Oliver Lodge, and of others who waded through years of scepticism show that it is not a question of strength or of weakness. Our project as a denomination is to give Christ a fair chance to organize the life of the student and it would be short-sighted policy to neutralize our efforts. The soul assuredly must find its way but the experience of others can do much for it by way of direction, or we might as well throw up our hands in all missionary endeavor. Our denomination now is directly sensitive to the kind of professor who is appointed. Their sensitiveness could operate only indirectly under the changed conditions.

As to saving in expense, while it is important it has never been a deciding factor when principles seem to be involved; if it were, the heathen would never be reached with the gospel. I suppose Archibald Brutch need not have mortgaged his home if Baptists had been willing to accept \$600 a year from the Woodstock Council. The presumption is that no one could tell, after the closest theoretical examination, just what financial difference federation would make. To be sure of the result one would have to try it out. There are some indications, however, from the experiences of Victoria and Trinity, although it is to be expected that differences of computation would also be found in each case. It will be recalled that the Victoria professor who was quoted

in 1905 as favoring federation stated, "We spend as much money as before and probably more. . . . We have two or three men in one department where we only had one before." At a recent Senate meeting one of our Senators gave as the testimony of an official of Trinity who was in a position to judge, that it was costing Trinity more under federation. The Victoria professor probably supplied the reason, —although reduced to a school of languages the federated university had to provide instruction in the highly specialized courses of Toronto University. If you examine a calendar of Victoria or of Trinity you will find how comparisons run. Victoria has a larger attendance than McMaster; Trinity has considerably less. When the war broke out Victoria and Trinity each had a staff of six in Latin, Greek and Ancient History as against two at McMaster; Trinity had ten in modern languages including English, Victoria had eleven, McMaster had four. These include professors, lecturers, instructors and readers. Probably it would not be far from the mark to say that the specialized courses would require nearly double the staff. The McMaster ideal has been to give a more representative liberal education to the undergraduate and then to send him into post-graduate work, that is, to make a man sympathetic with humanity, a man who will be ready to take advantage of his specialized training and who will give a good account of himself when he works with the graduates of other colleges. We are apt to get a distorted view when we compare the facilities which are adequate to give instruction in Science to the extent which a man pursuing a liberal course of studies can find time to take, with the expensive facilities which are provided by the Provincial University for the technical and professional pursuit of science. If you were to give the undergraduate time to make adequate use of such facilities you would not give him time to obtain a liberal education. You would probably neglect the man in making the specialist prematurely.

In the long run it is not clear as to how the financial gain would stand, but in any case it would not be of such dimensions as certain naive opinions based upon a superficial glance would seem to indicate.

As to whether we could enter consistently with our Baptist principles, it has already been pointed out how cloudy the relation seems to be in the joining in an organic way of denominationally governed and politically governed bodies; what misgivings those who organized our educational movement and who were friends of the State University had regarding the present scheme of federation; how some thought that even if a fair case could be made out for federation on this point, it would not be expedient for us to act in that direction as it would be sure to put us always on the defensive and render it necessary for us to

try to explain how, with our views respecting Church and State, we were willing to allow the University of Toronto to do half the work and at the same time we got all the tuition fees. Dr. MacVicar stated his view as follows: "For my own part I firmly believe that the only right thing for us now to do in the interests of the denomination is to found an absolutely independent university. But when I say this I do not mean either rivalry or opposition to the State institution. On the contrary, I believe that the Provincial University has a legitimate and important work of its own to do and that in doing this work efficiently it should receive the most hearty endorsement of every true citizen. . . . As denominational workers we are not simply Christians. We are more. We are Baptist Christians and when we cease to work as Baptist Christians we are engaged in something outside and apart from the denomination. Our right to do this as individuals no one can question, but our right to do it as Christians or a denomination is exceedingly questionable."

### *5. Misunderstandings of Our Policy.*

The sources of some misunderstandings of our policy have already been referred to. It may be well to set forth concisely these and others.

(1) The misunderstanding that there is only so much money in the denomination to distribute among our enterprises, and the more one enterprise gets the less there will be left for the others. Experience has generally shown that the more you stimulate men to give in one direction, the more they are likely to give in another.

(2) The idea that the denomination would be saved large financial outlays through federation. This generally rests on the fallacy that McMaster is a rival of Toronto and in its liberal culture course in trying to make the man it will have to duplicate the expensive equipment of Toronto.

(3) The capitalist idea of trustifying education as you do steel and oil, scrap the small plants, centralize your executive and standardize your product. But you are not working on oil or steel, and even here trustification has its limits, but you are working on the living personalities of men and women in which variety and individuality are the most sacred elements for the future of the race. Such variations require variety of agencies for development. The field is so big, the material so precious, the work so complicated that every well-accredited agency should be welcome. A Procrustean bed of uniformity in which you stretch the limbs of some and chop off the feet of others to standardize them is an educational monstrosity.

(4) The idea that Christian education is not as missionary as evangelisation. It is evangelisation in the fullest significance of that term. It is a distinctive Baptist missionary enterprise with all the hall-marks of legitimacy. It is of supreme importance in its missionary field, in its unifying influence, in its promotion of well-equipped consecrated leadership.

(5) The idea that because McMaster is a small college it hardly merits large investment. Will you listen to educators like the late President Harper, the chief executive of one of the largest universities, when he says that the small college has the advantage in forming the undergraduate into a man? Will you examine the statistics of Professor Jastrow of Michigan where he finds from an analysis of "Who's Who" that the small colleges send out by far the greatest number of graduates who distinguish themselves? Will you get away from the conception that big material surroundings are necessary to produce big souls? I heard a well-informed man say a few days ago that two of the foremost modern exponents of Systematic Theology were McMaster men. A thought soars just as high and reaches just as far in a small building as in a large one.

(6) The idea that the Baptist educational programme is a selfish little denominational project smelling of musty mediæval ecclesiasticism and that what we ought to be doing is advancing the life of the nation and of humanity. That is just what we are doing. We are trying to furnish the nation an object lesson of what should be at the heart of education if the world is to save itself from heartless Prussianism in politics and in society. Moreover, we are sending out men and women into the life of the nation and of the world who worthily represent this conception. Our denomination does not live for itself. God forbid that we should glory just in a denomination or prattle about the great Baptist denomination. We are here to serve the interests of the Kingdom of God. We cannot serve these interests best, however, by de-throning conviction and by wobbling out an invertebrate existence in a supine opportunism. Not long ago an Anglican joined our staff in preference to going to another college on the recommendation of his Archbishop who said, "At least McMaster stands for something." Let us send Christ into the heart of men's associations. There is abundant room, nay there is a prime necessity, for a Christian University in this Canada of ours.

It is only a few years ago that men were crying out that there should be no Manchester University, no Leeds University, no Queen's University, no Western University, no McMaster University.

Professor Dyde in defending Queen's as an independent University said, "The loss of Queen's to Ontario would not be simply the loss of land, staff and endowment, but the extinction of a type which could not be compensated for by any enlargement of Toronto University on however generous scales." Dr. Adam Shortt declared, "All forms of educational monopoly and stereotyping are fatal to the spirit of alertness and expectation which must characterize a progressive civilisation."

The nation needs just such a University as McMaster and Christian people other than Baptists might very well render it generous support.

### III. THE LESSONS OF THE PAST FOR THE PRESENT.

1. The Past warns us against virulent discussion on points which may be important but not essential to the distinct existence of our denomination; against the dry rot of invincible indifference; against the distrust of our colleges which is often the result of ill-founded rumour; against the jealousy which is sometimes displayed over executive control being largely centralized in some city or town; against a narrow conception of a denomination's mission; against the attempt to escape the responsibilities of agency by saying that the Lord will provide leaders.

2. The Past challenges us to width of view, to depth of conviction, to great self-sacrifice, to consistency of action, to consecrated effort, to universal interest.

3. The policy we are pursuing in Christian college education at home is similar to the policy which missionaries have found they must pursue in foreign missions if their work is to be placed on a firm foundation and perpetuate itself. The missions with Christian schools are the missions which are outstripping the others. The Baptist missionaries formulated a report in which they said, "Every one of your missionaries has come to feel profoundly that no lasting foundations can be laid for the work which you have sent them to do without such Christian scholarship as can be acquired only in schools of their own faith."

4. In the present also we find that we have not exhausted our mandate respecting the right relation of Church to State. Dr. John Clifford, the veteran exponent of our principles in Britain, says, "The functions of Church and State must be kept apart, in control, in cost, in every way. Let the churches do their own work at their own cost and as they will, and the citizens do theirs in their own way and at their cost and without the interference of the churches. That is the only way to educational efficiency, social harmony and national progress."

5. But has not the war changed everything? Are not individualism and denominationalism and nationalism dead or dying? No war can change the constitution of man or the imperative demands of that constitution in development. No war can abolish the necessity of a Christian regulative centre to individual and national life. Selfish individualism, self-righteous non-cooperative denominationalism, spurious grasping nationalism deserve to die; but misinformed individualism, co-operative denominationalism, and nationalism which holds a mission for all the race, will live through the ages of history. An individual must be himself to be of service to others, a denomination must be true to the conscientious dictates of its soul or stultify itself, a world-state is a chimera apart from the Kingdom of God. The Christian college could still plead successfully the reason for its existence even if nations should merge the world over, denominations disappear and individualism be lost in some sort of philosophical Nirvana. Man is incurably religious, and only under the direction of religion will he find his larger self.

6. The Past challenges us to courageous confidence in the ability of a denomination to do great things which at times seem to be beyond their reach, and to face unexpected changes of circumstances with fortitude. Consider the call of to-day. The diminished purchasing power of the dollar has rendered the increase of salaries imperative. The Forward Movement is giving us the means to do this and to add some necessary equipment for the next five years. Steps must be taken to increase the endowment so that we can permanently meet the increased expenditure and other expenditures which will be necessary. If we are to continue our Arts work as it should be continued we must have a campus. The present location will not furnish this under any policy or change of policy. Removal means new buildings. To be able to increase our attendance as we have increased it without a campus or a gymnasium speaks volumes for the appeal which McMaster makes to students. No doubt new buildings on the new site with campus, gymnasium, and residences would largely increase the attendance.

Apart from Woodstock and Moulton properties which are worth some quarter of a million dollars, we have in the University buildings and site, with the endowment and investments, assets amounting to \$1,500,000. Over \$1,000,000 of this is endowment. We require another million or a million and a half to add to the proceeds from the sale of the old buildings and site. This would give us property worth \$1,000,000 and an endowment of \$2,000,000 or \$2,500,000.

Sometimes we are apt to minimize our present position. When you

compare University property worth half a million and an endowment of one million dollars with far-famed Baptist colleges of the United States our position is better understood. We are familiar with William Jewell, Mercer, Baylor, and Brown. The first three of these have been running for seventy or eighty years, and Brown for 156 years. In 1915 William Jewell had an endowment of \$636,000 and property worth \$400,000; Mercer an endowment of \$320,000 and property worth \$225,000; Baylor an endowment of \$400,000 and property worth \$565,000; Brown, whose President must be a Baptist, an endowment of \$3,250,000 and property worth \$2,000,000. Brown is 156 years old and one of the strong universities on the continent. In 1887, when we were obtaining our Charter, its endowment after 123 years of history was \$1,600,000 and its property worth \$215,000. If McMaster could place its endowment and property on the scale mentioned above in this generation and could preserve the genius of its institutions she would be doing greater things than Brown did.

7. The challenge of the Past, therefore, is mingled with that of the Present. Baptists of the United States have met this challenge by raising fifty-four million dollars for their denominational schools. They furnish us an example worth emulating. At the beginning of the last generation, thirty years ago, Mr. McMaster gave our educational project the impetus which has enabled it to do the gracious work it has accomplished. What man or men will lead the denomination through their gifts in setting it on its way of higher efficiency for this generation? And when these men arise we shall profit by the recognition of the mistakes of the past in not relieving the churches of their contributions for leadership, but we shall endeavor to keep the institutions close to the hearts of our people by asking them to invest regularly their life products in the life-development of Christian manhood and womanhood.

8. And those men and women who are to show the way to greater financial stability should act at once. We cannot, with any dignity, have a University without a campus. We cannot carry on Arts work with our present endowment, no matter what policy may be adopted. We will strengthen our endowment if it is only a question of ability to do so, as the Forward Movement has abundantly proved. If we are forced to cripple our work the members of the denomination will not be held guiltless of refusing to furnish the means to produce as many and as well-equipped leaders as possible. If the sense of mission passes from us the world will wag their heads and the powers on high will write "Ichabod" over our gates, and that denomination which has stood, as no other denomination has, for the sacredness of human

personality which is the key to modern philosophy—for the necessity of intelligent soul activity in all spiritual growth which is the centre of modern pedagogy; for the soul liberty for which our men laid down their lives in the great war; for democracy in Church government and for other tenets indispensable to the full development of man,—that denomination will have brought reproach upon itself and will have dragged the glory of our fathers in the dust. There is greater and ever greater progress for us if we are true to our mission. Whether the denomination will play a larger and larger part in the redemption of mankind or a smaller and smaller part depends upon its leadership. The providing of that leadership depends upon our colleges. The colleges depend upon the support which you give them. The future is in the hands of this generation and God will hold you responsible for your trusteeship. All investments in missionary work are of very doubtful value unless there are corresponding investments in leadership.

No greater contribution can be made to the next generation than that which will place McMaster with adequate equipment and endowment in a position to do her work efficiently and thus to minister to the Christian leadership of the world. And each succeeding generation will rise up and call their benefactors blessed, even as our hearts go out in gratitude to those who built the McMaster of to-day.

